Submission ID: 5180

The construction of a nuclear power station in an AONB and SSI could only be justified if there was an overwhelming economic need, and if every possible step were taken to mitigate the social and environmental impact. Neither is the case.

The economic arguments against another nuclear power station are overwhelming - it will generate power at exorbitant cost by technology that will be out dated by the time it is built, and will saddle future generations with the even vaster cost of dismantling when obsolete and indefinite storage of nuclear waste.

Those arguments relate largely to the future - in a decade or more when the plant is operating. Of immediate and pressing concern are the damage to Suffolk's economy, environment and quality of life while the plant and its associated facilities are being built. The local roads (and even the main A12) are quite unsuited to the traffic volumes projected by EDF and the inevitable congestion will have a hugely damaging impact on tourism and the arts (particularly the world renowned performance centre at Snape Maltings) - as well as destroying the quality of life for local residents and damaging property values throughout north-east Suffolk. The equally renowned RSPB reserve at Minsmere will be at grave risk, and the damage to the entire AONB (whither direct or indirect) will be catastrophic for nature, tourism, inhabitants and visitors.

These are not small scale risks, amenable to remedy, but huge, long-term damage.

The only true remedy is not to build this costly white elephant - but if it is to proceed, purely for political reasons and in the corporate interest of those involved in its construction - then the best way of minimising some of the damage would be to ensure that all material used in its construction is delivered direct to the site, by sea. Expensive? Of course, but trivial in the context of the already huge estimates for the project as a whole and trivial by comparison to the costs to the environment and local economy if the project were to go ahead as planned.

We shall not need this power source in a decade's time, given the progress in alternative methods of power generation and storage. We should not be lumbering ourselves and future generations with its enormous and unnecessary costs. We should not be wrecking the environment and economy of Suffolk.

Planning for Sizewell C and its associated facilities should be refused. Simon Loftus OBE